Thank you for participating in today’s meeting. The Transportation Committee encourages public participation and invites you to share your views on agenda items.

MEETINGS: Regular Meetings of the Transportation Committee are held on the second Thursday of each month at 4:00 PM at the Foothill Transit Building (100 S. Vincent Avenue, Suite 200, West Covina, CA 91790). The Transportation Committee agenda packet is available at the San Gabriel Valley Council of Government’s (SGVCOG) Office, 1000 S. Fremont Avenue, Suite 10-210, Alhambra, CA 91803, and on the website, www.sgvcog.org. Copies are available via email upon request (sgv@sgvcog.org). Documents distributed to a majority of the Committee after the posting will be available for review in the SGVCOG office and on the SGVCOG website. Attendance at this public meeting may result in the recording of your voice.

CITIZEN PARTICIPATION: Your participation is welcomed and invited at all Transportation Committee meetings. Time is reserved at each regular meeting for those who wish to address the Committee. The SGVCOG requests that persons addressing the Committee refrain from making personal, slanderous, profane, or disruptive remarks.

TO ADDRESS THE TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE: At a regular meeting, the public may comment on any matter within the jurisdiction of the Committee during the public comment period and may also comment on any agenda item at the time it is discussed. At a special meeting, the public may only comment on items that are on the agenda. Members of the public wishing to speak are asked to complete a comment card or simply rise to be recognized when the Chair asks for public comments to speak. We ask that members of the public state their name for the record and keep their remarks brief. If several persons wish to address the Committee on a single item, the Chair may impose a time limit on individual remarks at the beginning of discussion. The Transportation Committee may not discuss or vote on items not on the agenda.

AGENDA ITEMS: The Agenda contains the regular order of business of the Transportation Committee. Items on the Agenda have generally been reviewed and investigated by the staff in advance of the meeting so that the Transportation Committee can be fully informed about a matter before making its decision.

CONSENT CALENDAR: Items listed on the Consent Calendar are considered to be routine and will be acted upon by one motion. There will be no separate discussion on these items unless a Committee member or citizen so requests. In this event, the item will be removed from the Consent Calendar and considered after the Consent Calendar. If you would like an item on the Consent Calendar discussed, simply tell Staff or a member of the Committee.
*MEETING MODIFICATIONS DUE TO THE STATE AND LOCAL STATE OF EMERGENCY RESULTING FROM THE THREAT OF COVID-19: On March 17, 2020, Governor Gavin Newsom issued Executive Order N-29-20 authorizing a local legislative body to hold public meetings via teleconferencing and allows for members of the public to observe and address the meeting telephonically or electronically to promote social distancing due to the state and local State of Emergency resulting from the threat of the Novel Coronavirus (COVID-19).

To follow the new Order issued by the Governor and ensure the safety of Committee Members and staff for the purpose of limiting the risk of COVID-19, in-person public participation at the Transportation Committee meeting scheduled for June 10, 2021 at 4:00 p.m. will not be allowed. To allow for public participation, the Transportation Committee will conduct its meeting through Zoom Video Communications. To participate in the meeting, download Zoom on any phone or computer device and copy and paste the following link into your browser to access the live meeting: https://zoom.us/j/97465790739. You may also access the meeting via the livestream link on the front of the agenda page.

Submission of Public Comments: For those wishing to make public comments on agenda and non-agenda items you may submit comments via email or by Zoom.

- **Email:** Please submit via email your public comment to SGVCOG Management Analyst, Alexander Fung, at afung@sgvcog.org at least 1 hour prior to the scheduled meeting time. Please indicate in the Subject Line of the email “FOR PUBLIC COMMENT.” Emailed public comments will be read into the record and will be part of the recorded meeting minutes. Public comment may be summarized in the interest of time, however the full text will be provided to all members of the Committee prior to the meeting.

- **Zoom:** Through Zoom, you may speak by using the web interface “Raise Hand” feature. Wait to be called upon by staff, and then you may provide verbal comments for up to 3 minutes. Public comment is taken at the beginning of the meeting for items not on the agenda. Public comment is also accepted at the beginning of each agenda item.

Any member of the public requiring a reasonable accommodation to participate in this meeting should contact SGVCOG Management Analyst, Alexander Fung, at least 48 hours prior to the meeting at (626) 457-1800 or at afung@sgvcog.org.
PRELIMINARY BUSINESS 5 MINUTES
1. Call to Order
2. Pledge of Allegiance
3. Roll Call
4. Public Comment *(If necessary, the Chair may place reasonable time limits on all public comments)*
5. Changes to the Agenda Order: Identify emergency items arising after agenda posting and requiring action prior to next regular meeting.

CONSENT CALENDAR 5 MINUTES
(It is anticipated that the Committee may take action on the following matters)
6. Review Transportation Committee Meeting Minutes: 05/13/2021 *(Page 1)*
   Recommended Action: Review and approve.
7. FY 2021-2022 Committee Chair & Vice Chair Elections
   Recommended Action: Elect San Gabriel City Councilmember Jason Pu as the FY 2021-2022 Transportation Committee Chair and Claremont City Councilmember Ed Reece as the FY 2021-2022 Transportation Committee Vice Chair.

ACTION ITEM 20 MINUTES
(It is anticipated that the Committee may take action on the following matters)
8. Metro Strategic Project List – Alexander Fung, Management Analyst, SGVCOG *(Page 6)*
   Recommended Action: Recommend the Governing Board to adopt the list of San Gabriel Valley regional transportation projects and programs to be included on the Metro Strategic Project List.

UPDATE ITEM 20 MINUTES
(It is anticipated that the Committee may take action on the following matters)
   Recommended Action: For information only.

PRESENTATIONS 40 MINUTES
(It is anticipated that the Committee may take action on the following matters)
10. Glendora First/Last Mile Demonstrations – Steven Mateer, Transportation Manager, City of Glendora *(Page 32)*
    Recommended Action: For information only.
11. Metro Homelessness Programs – Judy Gerhardt, Systems Security and Law Enforcement Chief, Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority *(Page 34)*
    Recommended Action: For information only.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR’S REPORT 5 MINUTES
12. Oral Report

LIAISON REPORTS 10 MINUTES
13. Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority Report
14. Foothill Transit Report
15. Gold Line Foothill Extension Construction Authority Report
16. Metrolink Report
ANNOUNCEMENTS

ADJOURN
SGVCOG Transportation Committee Meeting Minutes

Date: May 13, 2021
Time: 4:00 PM
Location: Zoom Virtual Meeting

PRELIMINARY BUSINESS

1. Call to Order
   J. Pu called the meeting to order at 4:02pm.

2. Pledge of Allegiance
   T. Sandoval led the Transportation Committee in the Pledge of Allegiance.

3. Roll Call
   A quorum was in attendance.

   **Committee Members Present**
   | Alhambra | Adele Andrade-Stadler |
   | Claremont | Ed Reece |
   | Diamond Bar | David Liu |
   | Glendora | Steven Mateer |
   | Industry | Cory Moss |
   | La Cañada Flintridge | Keith Eich |
   | Monterey Park | Peter Chan |
   | Pasadena | Laura Cornejo |
   | Pomona | Tim Sandoval |
   | San Gabriel | Jason Pu |
   | South El Monte | Gloria Olmos |
   | Temple City | Ashley Avery |
   | Walnut | Allen Wu |
   | L.A. County District #1 | Martin Reyes |
   | L.A. County District #4 | Jamie Hwang |

   **Absent**
   | Duarte |
   | South Pasadena |
   | L.A. County District #5 |

   **Guests**
   | Alta | Ryan Johnson |
   | Caltrans District 7 | Cuong Trinh |
   | City of Industry | Josh Nelson |
   | City of Pasadena | Donson Liu |
   | Foothill Transit | Yoko Igawa |
   | HDR, Inc. | Wayne Richardson |
   | Metro | Eva Moir |
   | Metro | Marie Kim |
   | Metro | Mary Lou Echternach |
   | Metro | Robert Gutierrez |
   | Metro | Shelly Wuan |
   | Metro | Tito Corona |

   **SGVCOG Staff**
   | M. Creter, Executive Director |
   | K. Ward, Staff |
   | A. Fung, Staff |
4. Public Comment
   There were no public comments at this meeting.

5. Changes to Agenda Order
   There were no changes to the Agenda Order.

CONSENT CALENDAR
6. Transportation Committee Meeting Minutes – 04/08/2021
   Action: Review and approve.

There was a motion to approve consent calendar item 6. (M/S: G. Olmos/T. Sandoval) [Motion Passed]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AYES:</th>
<th>Alhambra, Claremont, Glendora, Industry, La Cañada Flintridge, Monterey Park, Pasadena, Pomona, San Gabriel, South El Monte, Temple City, Walnut, L.A. County District #1, L.A. County District #4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NOES:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ABSTAIN:</td>
<td>Diamond Bar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO VOTE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RECORDED:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ABSENT:</td>
<td>Duarte, South Pasadena, L.A. County District #5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PRESENTATIONS
7. Arrow Highway Multimodal Regional Corridor Plan
   Alta Planning and Design, Inc. Planning Associate, Ryan Johnson, provided the presentation on this item. Supported by the SGVCOG and the Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG), the Arrow Highway Multimodal Regional Corridor Plan aimed to develop recommendations for bicycle and pedestrian enhancements along Arrow Highway and surrounding streets to improve east-west mobility, safety, and connectivity within the Cities of Claremont, Glendora, La Verne, Pomona, and San Dimas. Based on community feedback, the Plan recommends that sidewalks, crosswalks, bikeways, lighting, and other new facilities be developed or enhanced to provide safe places for residents and commuters to walk, bike, and roll.

Key Questions/Discussions:
- A. Wu inquired about the definition of “TMC” and “ADT.” Mr. Johnson responded “TMC” refers to vehicle turning movement counts and “ADT” refers to average daily traffic volumes.
- A. Wu inquired about difficulties with implementing the Plan’s suggestions. Mr. Johnson responded that it may be difficult to reduce or narrow travel lanes in various segments of the Arrow Highway given that different segments experience different traffic volumes. Additionally, a further engineering study will need to be completed to examine water drainage issues.
A. Andrade-Stadler inquired about data that can highlight implementing traffic striping would lead to traffic calming. Mr. Johnson responded that studies have proven that narrowing lanes can reduce a roadway’s average travel speed without significantly impacting traffic volume; however, buses and freight trucks would typically require wider lanes.

J. Pu inquired about cities’ feedback on having parking spaces along Arrow Highway. Mr. Johnson responded that the Plan examined Arrow Highway by segment to evaluate the needs of parking spaces along the Highway. Several segments of Arrow Highway in La Verne and San Dimas currently do not have any parking spaces. The Plan had an objective of keeping parking spaces where they currently exist but does not propose new parking spaces. Some cities expressed a willingness to eliminate parking spaces if off-street parking is available.

T. Sandoval inquired about the process to implement the Plan’s recommendations. Mr. Johnson responded that cities along the Arrow Highway can jointly apply for grants to implement the recommendations regionally. M. Creter added that the SGVCOG can serve as an agency to lead the implementation on the Plan’s recommendations.

G. Olmos suggested that keeping parking spaces along Arrow Highway can help the project receive additional constituent support and requested the SGVCOG to continue updating member agencies on possible grant opportunities.

8. California Department of Transportation District 7 Active Transportation Plan
Caltrans Senior Transportation Planner, Cuong Phu Trinh, provided the presentation on this item. The Plan will identify locations for pedestrian and bicycle improvements, on, across, or parallel to the State Highway System across the Counties of Los Angeles and Ventura. Results of the Plan will inform and assist the implementation of active transportation projects for Los Angeles County and Ventura County residents and improve accessibility and neighborhood circulation for individuals who walk, bike, and use public transit.

Key Questions/Discussions:

- J. Pu inquired about the survey’s deadline. Mr. Trinh responded that the survey is scheduled to close next week; however, the response deadline is anticipated to be extended.

- J. Pu inquired about state and federal resources and funding that can address areas with active transportation deficiencies. Mr. Trinh responded that results from the Plan can support Caltrans to identify and address areas with active transportation deficiencies.

- P. Chan requested Caltrans to share the survey link with San Gabriel Valley cities and inquired about Caltrans’ role in supporting local jurisdiction’s active transportation projects. Mr. Trinh responded that active transportation projects that cross freeway overpasses and underpasses overlap with local jurisdictions’ right-of-way. Often, a bike lane or a sidewalk would end at a freeway underpass. Local jurisdictions can provide feedback on areas with active transportation deficiencies by submitting responses on the survey.
• A. Andrade-Stadler inquired about Caltrans’ strategy for including Safe Routes to School plans. Mr. Trinh responded Caltrans has shifted to create a transportation system for all modes of transportation users and that elements of the Safe Routes to School plans can be included in the Caltrans District 7 Active Transportation Plan based on jurisdictions’ feedback.

• D. Liu suggested that the SGVCOG Public Works Technical Advisory Committee can provide Caltrans with important technical feedback.

DISCUSSION ITEM
9. Metro FY 2022 Budget
Metro staff provided updates on the Metro FY 2022 Budget Development Process. As Metro staff prepares to conduct public hearings on the proposed budget, preliminary estimates of the agency’s $8 billion proposed budget were recently released. It is anticipated that Metro’s funding sources for FY 2022 include sales tax revenues, grants, bond proceeds, fares, toll fees, advertising revenues, and federal stimulus funding. The Metro Board of Directors is scheduled to adopt the final FY 2022 Budget at its upcoming meeting on May 27, 2021.

Key Questions/Discussions:
• J. Pu inquired about whether this presentation was provided to the Metro Board of Directors. Metro staff responded that the Metro Board of Directors is aware of the budget proposal.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR’S REPORT
10. Oral Report
SGVCOG Executive Director, Marisa Creter, provided a report.

LIAISON REPORTS
11. Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority Report
Metro Board Member, Tim Sandoval, and Metro Board Deputy, Mary Lou Echternach, provided reports on this item.

12. Foothill Transit Report
Foothill Transit Public Affairs Manager, Yoko Igawa, provided a report.

Committee Vice Chair and Gold Line Foothill Extension Construction Authority Board Member, Ed Reece, provided a report.

14. Metrolink Report
There were no reports on this item.

ANNOUNCEMENTS
J. Pu provided an announcement about the Lyft Community Grant Program.

ADJOURN
J. Pu adjourned the Transportation Committee meeting at 5:45pm.
RECOMMENDED ACTION

Recommend the Governing Board to adopt the list of San Gabriel Valley regional transportation projects and programs to be included on the Metro Strategic Project List.

SUMMARY

The Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority (Metro) adopted the Long Range Transportation Plan (LRTP) last year to provide a detailed roadmap for guiding Metro’s plan to build, operate, maintain, and partner for improved mobility over the next three decades. Included in the LRTP is the development of the Short Range Transportation Plan (SRTP), a 10-15 year action plan which contains the Strategic Project List (SPL). The SPL includes a list of planned but unfunded major transportation projects and approved transportation programs submitted to Metro from any of the nine councils of governments (COGs) in Los Angeles County.

The SPL includes two major components:

1. **Major Projects Component**: A list of defined projects that support transit, roadway, bicycle, and pedestrian travel and goods movement.
2. **Programs Component**: Capital investments in transportation programs that have been approved by a subregional COG in Los Angeles County.

Metro stated that the SPL is not a prioritized list and is not tied to existing funding sources or any specific future funding sources. Additionally, only projects of regional transportation significance should be included in the SPL. Local transportation projects may be eligible for the Multi-Year Subregional Program (MSP) funding or local return funding regardless of their listing on the SPL.

Furthermore, a project included in the SPL does not commit Metro or the COGs to fund the project; however, the existence of an up-to-date funded project list will be beneficial for Metro’s regional planning efforts and identify Los Angeles County’s overall transportation and funding needs.

ELIGIBLE SPL PROJECTS AND PROGRAMS

Eligible projects for the SPL’s **Major Projects Component** include planned or defined projects that support transit, roadway, bicycle, and pedestrian travel and goods movement. Specifically, projects under the Major Projects Component must meet one of the below criteria for inclusion in the SPL. These projects criteria are broken into two tiers of projects based on their relative size and scope.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Transit Projects</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tier 1</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• All light rail, heavy rail, commuter rail, streetcar, and dedicated right-of-way bus rapid transit projects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Grade separate projects for existing fixed-guideway transit lines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tier 2</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Purchase of electric or other zero-emission buses</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Active Transportation and Complete Streets</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tier 1</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Class I multi-use paths or Class VI cycle tracks that are greater than 3 miles in length or that cross multiple jurisdictions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Complete Streets projects that cross multiple jurisdictions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• New pedestrian and bicycle overcrossings and underpasses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tier 2</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Class I multi-use paths or Class VI cycle tracks that provide direct access to fixed guideway transit</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Highway Projects</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tier 1</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Any new high-occupancy toll (HOT) lane(s) or upgrades to existing facilities; or additions to high-occupancy vehicle (HOV) lane(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• New interchange or direct connector</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tier 2</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• New auxiliary lanes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Multi-jurisdictional arterial improvement project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Countywide or subregion-wide ITS project</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goods Movement Projects</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tier 1</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Grade separation projects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Dedicated truck facilities or truck toll facilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tier 2</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Project occurs on the countywide Strategic Truck Arterial Network</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Projects of Any Mode</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tier 1</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Any defined transportation project with a project cost that exceeds $50 million</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Eligible projects for the SPL’s **Approved Programs Component** include transportation programs that have been approved by the Metro Board of Directors, a COG Governing Board, or another entity on behalf of multiple jurisdictions. These programs must be related to transportation by increasing the mobility of individuals or goods, reducing conflicts, increasing safety, and eliminating the need for travel. Such programs must result in future capital projects. For example, a subregion-wide Vision Zero Program is eligible to be included on the SPL under the Approved Programs Component as long as it includes multiple capital projects aimed at increasing safety.

**MAJOR UNFUNDED PROGRAMS AND PROGRAMS IN THE SAN GABRIEL VALLEY**

Metro recently requested all of the COGs to submit eligible projects and programs for inclusion on the SPL by June 30, 2021. Each project to be included in the SPL must be submitted to Metro with the appropriate request form.
Upon examining the eligibility criteria, staff has identified a preliminary recommended list of projects in the San Gabriel Valley to be included in the SPL:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Title</th>
<th>Jurisdiction</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Est’d Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Montebello Blvd Grade Separation</td>
<td>City of Montebello</td>
<td>Major Project</td>
<td>Goods Mvmt</td>
<td>$188M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turnbull Canyon Road Grade Separation</td>
<td>City of Industry</td>
<td>Major Project</td>
<td>Goods Mvmt</td>
<td>$84M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maple Ave Pedestrian Overhead Crossing</td>
<td>City of Montebello</td>
<td>Major Project</td>
<td>Active Transp./Goods Mvmt</td>
<td>$26M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pomona At-Grade Crossings Pedestrian Safety</td>
<td>City of Pomona</td>
<td>Major Project</td>
<td>Active Transp./Goods Mvmt</td>
<td>$26M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Route 57/60 Confluence Chokepoint Relief Program</td>
<td>City of Diamond Bar</td>
<td>Major Project</td>
<td>Highways</td>
<td>$450M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-605/Valley Boulevard Interchange Improvement Project</td>
<td>City of Industry</td>
<td>Major Project</td>
<td>Highways</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La Verne Transit Oriented Development (TOD) Pedestrian Bridge</td>
<td>City of La Verne</td>
<td>Major Project</td>
<td>Active Transp./Transit</td>
<td>$7M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foothill Gold Line Extension (Pomona to Montclair)</td>
<td>SGVCOG</td>
<td>Major Project</td>
<td>Transit</td>
<td>$465M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arrow Highway Multimodal Regional Corridor Improvements</td>
<td>SGVCOG</td>
<td>Major Project</td>
<td>Active Transp.</td>
<td>$6.9M - $10.3M</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Due to the short turnaround time set forth by Metro, staff solicited feedback from San Gabriel Valley cities and agencies for additional eligible projects and programs that can be included in the SPL. As a result, cities and agencies proposed to include the following additional projects and programs:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Title</th>
<th>Jurisdiction</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Est’d Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alhambra Citywide ACT Bus Ridership Study</td>
<td>City of Alhambra</td>
<td>Major Project</td>
<td>Transit</td>
<td>$0.3M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alhambra Bus Shelter Replacements</td>
<td>City of Alhambra</td>
<td>Major Project</td>
<td>Transit</td>
<td>$0.5M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alhambra Pedestrian Safety Countdown Signal Heads</td>
<td>City of Alhambra</td>
<td>Major Project</td>
<td>Active Transp.</td>
<td>$0.43M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alhambra Fixed Transit Route Electrification Including Related Infrastructure</td>
<td>City of Alhambra</td>
<td>Major Project</td>
<td>Transit</td>
<td>$5M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alhambra Electric Vehicle Charging Stations</td>
<td>City of Alhambra</td>
<td>Major Project</td>
<td>Active Transp.</td>
<td>$0.3M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorado Street Complete Streets Project</td>
<td>City of Arcadia</td>
<td>Major Project</td>
<td>Active Transp.</td>
<td>$2.85M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Description</td>
<td>City of Glendora</td>
<td>Major Project Type</td>
<td>City/County</td>
<td>Total Cost</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Glendora Transit Fleet Electrification</td>
<td>City of Glendora</td>
<td>Major Project</td>
<td>Transit</td>
<td>$3.85M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Glendora People Movement Project</td>
<td>City of Glendora</td>
<td>Major Project</td>
<td>Active Transp.</td>
<td>$16.45M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allen Ave. Safety Project – Design and Construction</td>
<td>City of Pasadena</td>
<td>Major Project</td>
<td>Active Transp.</td>
<td>$11M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pasadena Transit Maintenance Facility</td>
<td>City of Pasadena</td>
<td>Major Project</td>
<td>Transit</td>
<td>$33M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementation of the Bicycle Transportation Action Plan</td>
<td>City of Pasadena</td>
<td>Approved Program</td>
<td>Active Transp.</td>
<td>$12.5M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bus Stop Improvement Program</td>
<td>City of Pasadena</td>
<td>Major Project</td>
<td>Active Transp./Transit</td>
<td>$1.7M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N. Lake Ave. Safety Project – Design and Construction</td>
<td>City of Pasadena</td>
<td>Major Project</td>
<td>Active Transp.</td>
<td>$5M - $7M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purchase Replacement and Expansion Buses for Pasadena Transit and Pasadena Dial-A-Ride</td>
<td>City of Pasadena</td>
<td>Approved Program</td>
<td>Transit</td>
<td>$60M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Replace Aging Bus Stop Shelters</td>
<td>City of Pasadena</td>
<td>Major Project</td>
<td>Transit</td>
<td>$4M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rosemont Ave. Complete Streets Project</td>
<td>City of Pasadena</td>
<td>Major Project</td>
<td>Active Transp.</td>
<td>$2.1M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Arroyo Link</td>
<td>City of Pasadena</td>
<td>Major Project</td>
<td>Active Transp.</td>
<td>$1.2M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citywide Transportation Performance Monitoring Network</td>
<td>City of Pasadena</td>
<td>Approved Program</td>
<td>Active Transp.</td>
<td>$3.2M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meridian Avenue (within north-south City limits)</td>
<td>City of South Pasadena</td>
<td>Major Project</td>
<td>Active Transp.</td>
<td>$15M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garfield Avenue (Huntington Dr. to Fair Oaks Ave.)</td>
<td>City of South Pasadena</td>
<td>Major Project</td>
<td>Active Transp.</td>
<td>$6M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fremont Avenue (Columbia St. to Alhambra Rd.)</td>
<td>City of South Pasadena</td>
<td>Major Project</td>
<td>Active Transp.</td>
<td>$5M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monterey Road and Pasadena Avenue (Garfield Ave. to SR-110)</td>
<td>City of South Pasadena</td>
<td>Major Project</td>
<td>Active Transp.</td>
<td>$20M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Huntington Drive</td>
<td>City of South Pasadena</td>
<td>Major Project</td>
<td>Active Transp.</td>
<td>$20M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Columbia Street (shared with City of Pasadena)</td>
<td>City of South Pasadena</td>
<td>Major Project</td>
<td>Active Transp.</td>
<td>$5M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mission Street</td>
<td>City of South Pasadena</td>
<td>Major Project</td>
<td>Active Transp.</td>
<td>$6M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Angeles County Transit Fleet Electrification – San Gabriel Valley Subregion</td>
<td>County of Los Angeles</td>
<td>Major Project</td>
<td>Transit</td>
<td>$5M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amar Road Complete Streets Project</td>
<td>County of Los Angeles</td>
<td>Major Project</td>
<td>Active Transp.</td>
<td>$33M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Jose Creek Regional Access</td>
<td>County of Los Angeles</td>
<td>Major Project</td>
<td>Active Transp.</td>
<td>$16.5M</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is important to note that the Cities of Pasadena and South Pasadena’s projects and programs are also included in the Arroyo Verdugo Communities Joint Powers Authority’s (AVCJPA) proposed list of projects and programs given that the two cities are part of both the SGVCOG and AVCJPA.
Members of the Transportation Committee are asked to review the 38 submitted projects and programs listed above and recommend the Governing Board to adopt the list of requested projects. Details of the submitted projects can be found on the SGVCOG website at [www.sgvcog.org/2021-metro-spl](http://www.sgvcog.org/2021-metro-spl). Once approved by the Governing Board, staff will transmit the adopted list to Metro by June 30, 2021.

SGVCOG Management Analyst, Alexander Fung, will provide a presentation at this meeting.

Prepared by: ____________________________

Alexander P. Fung
Management Analyst

Approved by: ____________________________

Marisa Creter
Executive Director
DATE: June 10, 2021
TO: Transportation Committee
FROM: Marisa Creter, Executive Director
RE: SAN GABRIEL VALLEY TRANSIT FEASIBILITY STUDY UPDATES

RECOMMENDED ACTION

For information only.

BACKGROUND

On May 20, 2021, the SGVCOG Governing Board approved a professional contract with Kimley-Horn and Associates, Inc. to conduct the technical analyses for the San Gabriel Valley Transit Feasibility Study. On June 1st, the Executive Director approved a Task Order with Hill International, Inc. for providing public outreach services in support of Kimley-Horn’s analyses for the project. The Notice to Proceed (NTP) for both contracts are to be issued in mid-June and the project kick-off meeting has been scheduled for July 9, 2021.

The Scopes of Work to be performed by Kimley-Horn and Hill International can be found in Attachments A and B, respectively. SGVCOG Chief Engineer/Director of Capital Projects, Eric Shen, will provide updates on this item.

Prepared by: ____________________________________________
Eric C. Shen, PE, PTP
Director of Capital Projects

Approved by: ________________________
Marisa Creter
Executive Director

ATTACHMENTS

Attachment B – Scope of Work: Hill International
TASK 1: ADMINISTRATIVE AND PROJECT MANAGEMENT
The Consultant will provide written monthly Progress Reports providing the status of the work effort, progress, and schedule using a format approved by SGVCOG to facilitate invoice review and approval.

Task 1.1 General Project Management
The Consultant’s Project Manager is responsible for monitoring project performance and, if necessary, adjusting project resources to accomplish activities in a manner consistent with the adopted scope, budget, and schedule. The Consultant will report all corrective measures to the SGVCOG Project Manager for review and approval.

Project Implementation Plan (PIP): The Consultant will submit a draft Project Implementation Plan to SGVCOG for review and acceptance. A final version will be provided incorporating comments from SGVCOG. The final Project Implementation Plan will be a controlled document which will not be updated without the permission of the SGVCOG Project Manager.

The Consultant will provide all required deliverables, both Draft and Final version of reports and technical documents to SGVCOG for review and acceptance.

The Project Implementation Plan will demonstrate an integrated approach to managing the work effort that will control the schedule(s), invoicing, and quality of work including the following elements:

- Key Personnel and Subject Matter Experts including Project Organization Chart
- Work Activities – as indicated in this Scope of Work (SOW)
- Project Controls resources and responsibilities
- Procedures for Coordination of Work Effort including Sub-Consultant Management
- Communications Plan

- Document Control Log: The Consultant will maintain a Document Control Log (DCL) which will track the submittal status of draft and final versions of reports and project deliverable documents. Each deliverable entered into the DCL will certify to the entire Project Team that the deliverable has been formally submitted to SGVCOG and that the document can be reviewed, but not altered.

- Quality Control Plan: The Consultant will submit a Quality Assurance/Quality Control (QA/QC) plan for review as part of the Project Implementation Plan.
• Project Schedule: The Consultant will develop, maintain, and manage the Project Schedule using the MS Project software. The Consultant will submit an initial and final Project Schedule (Schedule) to SGVCOG as a part of the Project Implementation Plan. The Project Schedule will be detailed with tasks, review durations and the critical path items identified. Upon approval of the final Schedule by the SGVCOG Project Manager, it will be recorded in the file as the Baseline Schedule.

The Schedule will be updated on a monthly basis and submitted in conjunction with the Monthly Progress Reports to reflect deliverables and adjustments. In the event of schedule slippage, the Consultant will propose mitigation measures to bring the Study back on track.

Computerized Project Folder: The Consultant will provide a password-protected project folder that is accessible to the SGVCOG Project Manager and Project Team via the Internet (e.g., a file transfer protocol (FTP) site, SharePoint, ProjectWise, etc.). The folder will be made accessible and usable to the SGVCOG Project Manager with the subfolder organization pending SGVCOG approval. This project folder will contain documentation related to the Study including the Schedule, Project Implementation Plan, correspondence, meeting minutes, reports, maps, photos, work plans, project deliverables, reference documents, technical documents and data.

The Project Folder will be updated within two (2) working days with an editable version and clean PDF of deliverables submitted to indicate that the deliverable is a controlled document which cannot be altered, and the DCL will be updated to indicate the status of the deliverable.

Upon completion of the Study, contents will be transferred to SGVCOG on CD/DVD, thumb drives, or electronically. The SGVCOG Project Manager will approve the organization of the folder after the Notice to Proceed (NTP) for the Contract.

DElIVERABLES:
• Draft and Final Project Implementation Plan (PIP) including Quality Assurance/Quality Control (QA/QC) System, Document Control Log (DCL) System, and Baseline Project Schedule
• Document Control Log (DCL) system for all contract deliverables approved by SGVCOG (to be updated throughout the project)
• Template for Monthly Progress Reports and Invoices
• Draft and Final Updated Project Schedule (monthly updates)
• Computerized Electronic Project Folder System, Organization (to be updated throughout the project)
Task 1.2 Kickoff Meeting

The purpose of the Project Kickoff Meeting is to provide a formal orientation of the Study and build a common understanding within the team. The meeting will include introductions, provide an overview of the project, define roles and responsibilities, including the number of internal SGVCOG staff necessary to complete the Study, identify required tasks, outline team rules and project management processes, identify a communication plan, review schedule, identify key stakeholders and agencies, and review procedures outlined in the Scope of Services. The Consultant will draft presentation materials needed for the Kickoff Meeting with approval from the SGVCOG Project Manager.

The Consultant will provide a draft agenda and presentation to the SGVCOG Project Manager for approval in advance of the meeting. Following the Kickoff Meeting the Consultant will be responsible for providing meeting minutes, action items, and 30/60-day lookaheads.

DELIVERABLES:
- Draft and Final Kickoff Meeting Agenda
- Draft and Final Presentation
- Draft and Final meeting materials including agenda, sign in sheet, minutes, and lookaheads

Task 1.3 Progress Meetings

The Consultant will participate in Progress Meetings in order to track project progress and confirm timely delivery of the work product. Up to Twenty-four (24) Progress Meetings will be budgeted over the course of the effort. Meetings will be held bi-monthly for the first few months and then monthly thereafter, depending on the status of the project, with up to six (6) face-to-face at the SGVCOG Headquarters or through a virtual meeting format based on an extension of current health regulations. These meetings may include attendees other than SGVCOG Staff as requested by the SGVCOG Project Manager.

The Consultant's Project Manager will be in close communication with SGVCOG's Project Manager, removing the need for more frequent Progress Meetings. Internal Consultant Team meetings will be conducted with key staff to confirm the timely delivery of the work product and the effective coordination of the teamwork effort.

In coordination with the SGVCOG Project Manager, the Consultant will prepare a draft agenda for each of the bi-weekly meetings and will submit draft meeting materials for review by the SGVCOG Project Manager in advance of the scheduled meeting. Meeting minutes with attendees, date and assigned action items will be developed for each meeting, no later than three (3) business days after each meeting. After SGVCOG Project Manager’s approval, the minutes will be distributed to key staff and meeting attendees.

Draft, interim, or final reports, papers, summaries, narratives, or findings of a technical or non-technical nature prepared by the Consultant must receive approval from the
SGVCOG Project Manager prior to public distribution. Public distribution includes regularly scheduled meetings with outside agencies, elected offices, or meetings with the general public.

**DELIVERABLES:**
- Participation in up to twenty-four (24) Progress Meetings with a minimum of six (6) in person or through a virtual meeting format based on an extension of current health regulations

**Task 1.4 Management of Deliverables**

The Consultant will provide a Tech Memo or Report in machine-readable format suitable for distribution for deliverables for this Contract. The report template is subject to SGVCOG approval. The Consultant will post deliverables to the computerized Project Folder and will log each document in the DCL. The Consultant will be responsible for the quality of submittals in terms of content and readability.

The SGVCOG’s Project Manager, the Governmental Affairs Manager, and the SGVCOG’s Outreach Consultant will provide SGVCOG templates and standards consistent with SGVCOG design guidelines (such as the report templates, PowerPoint presentation, exhibits and boards) suitable to meet LACMTA Measure M Communication Guidelines.

**DELIVERABLES:**
- One (1) electronic copy of each deliverable/milestone document

**TASK 2: DEFINE BASELINES**

**Task 2.1 Study Area Definition**

The Consultant will prepare the following series of data sets:

- Demographic data (American Community Survey)
- Land use data (SCAG Land Use Database)
- Activity centers (Longitudinal Employment and Housing Dynamic; Travel Demand Model; LA County and SCAG databases)
- Travel time (Teralytics)
- Traffic volumes on freeways and arterials (Travel Demand Model; Caltrans Traffic Census; Available Local Traffic Counts)
- Existing and historical transit ridership (LA Metro, Foothill Transit; Montebello Bus Lines; Metrolink)

These will inform key transportation characteristics, illustrate the mobility needs within the San Gabriel Valley, and facilitate the definition of the project Study Area. The Study Area boundary will be designed to capture the service footprint to address the mobility needs of the San Gabriel Valley. It is assumed the identification of the Study Area will incorporate input from project stakeholders. Consensus on the Study Area is required prior to
beginning progress on the Study Area Definition and Mobility Problem Definition.

The Consultant will map and evaluate existing and horizon year demographic data including population growth and density, employment growth and density, zero-vehicle households, low income population, racial and ethnicity, and minority populations with a comparison to the whole of Los Angeles County.

The demographic analysis will identify the proportion of transit dependent populations in the Study Area by Transportation Analysis Zone (TAZ) so that a benefits and burdens analysis can evaluate the equity of proposed investments. A focus of the task will identify transit-dependent populations, households without private transportation, households with limited private transportation, households below the poverty level and minority populations as contained in Metro’s Equity Communities GIS layer. Demographic information will be evaluated at the Los Angeles County level and Study Area level for existing and horizon years.

The Consultant will incorporate the following current, and proposed jurisdictional plans including:

- Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG) 2020-2024 Regional Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategies (RTP/SCS)
- Metro 2020 Long Range Transportation Plan (2020 LRTP)
- Metro Vision 2028 Plan, Strategic Plan
- Metro NextGen Bus Plan
- Metro Equity Platform Framework
- Re-Evaluation Major Investment Study (2000)
- The Metro Rapid Demonstration Project (2000)
- SGVCOG Mobility Matrix
- SGVCOG Strategic Plan
- Eastside Transit Corridor Studies:
  - The Eastside Transit Corridor Phase 2 Final Alternatives Analysis Report (2009)
  - The Eastside Transit Corridor Phase 2 Alternatives Analysis Addendum (2009)
  - Eastside Transit Corridor Phase 2 Draft EIS/EIR (2014)
  - Post Draft EIS/EIR Technical Study (2017)
- Relevant local jurisdiction planning documents, and other specific plans or community plans in the vicinity of the Study Area, as indicated by SGVCOG and/or project stakeholders to provide a historical and planning context for the feasibility study.

The previous studies and projects summary will identify the alternatives that have already been studied and will assist in analyzing potential concepts.

The Consultant will conduct up to two (2) field reviews to obtain information regarding the existing physical configurations, general operating characteristics (transit, pedestrian,
and bicycle), transportation and parking conditions within the Study Area.

DELIVERABLES:
- Draft Study Area Definition
- Final Study Area Definition (to be incorporated in the Task 2.2 product)

**Task 2.2 Mobility Problem Definition**

In order to illustrate the mobility need and develop the Study purpose and needs/goals and objectives, the Consultant will evaluate existing and future traffic volumes on freeway and arterials (peak and off-peak), travel time, delay, vehicle miles traveled (VMT), trip productions and attractions, rail and bus service networks, major bus serviceridership patterns, bikeways, truck routes, and truck volumes.

The Consultant will identify opportunity catchment areas, major activity centers, and the transportation improvements using the Teralytics Origin-Destination dataset. The Consultant will develop exhibits to characterize the existing and future conditions including planned projects, rail infrastructure and service plans, potential opportunities for bus to rail system conversion, and potential operational constraints or criteria associated with future rail capacity. The Consultant will identify existing and planned bus and rail infrastructure such as routes, tracks, junctions, and stations potentially connecting the San Gabriel Valley with the regional transit network. The objective of this task is to better inform the development of the Study Area, identify feasible short-term and long-term solutions, and summarize existing conditions and future baseline (No Build) conditions.

Analysis of the travel patterns, mode shares, and existing bus and rail services including the Metro L (Gold) Line, Metrolink, and Foothill Transit and other local transit agencies will inform the feasibility of potential transit alternatives. The Consultant will identify any other data needs and sources with SGVCOG prior to beginning analysis.

DELIVERABLES:
- Draft and Final Mobility Problem Definition

**TASK 3: INITIAL SCREENING AND EVALUATION CRITERIA**

The Consultant will develop a series of screening criteria which will help scale down a large selection of concepts to a smaller batch of alternatives (up to three (3)). The evaluation criteria in turn will help in the selection of one or more alternatives for advancement into environmental analysis/further study.

**Task 3.1 Develop Screening Criteria**

Based on the goals and objectives developed in Task 2, and in conjunction with input from Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) and key stakeholder coordination, the Consultant will develop a methodology and criteria for conducting initial screening in Task 4.2 and feasibility screening in Task 7. The memo will describe the process for conducting a two-part feasibility screening, including a high-level, qualitative fatal-flaw screening of an
initial list of transit scenarios in Task 4.2 and a quantitative and qualitative screening of the refined list of transit scenarios in Task 7. These criteria are an important step in the analysis of concepts/alternatives and will be used to measure how well the concepts/alternatives achieve the study’s goals and objectives.

The initial screening criteria (qualitative and quantitative) will be developed using information from prior relevant studies and best practices on other planning studies. Mobility Problem analysis will be developed using readily-available online data sources. This will be used to screen and reduce the number of concepts (modes and alignments) to a set of approximately three (3) alternatives that will be carried forward into more detailed analyses and subsequent conceptual engineering. The screening methodology and criteria for reducing the number of concepts will be in sync with the goals and objectives identified as part of this task and allowing for the Consultant to evaluate each concept in relationship to the Mobility Problem Definition. The final criteria developed by the Consultant must be approved, prior to screening of concepts.

Screening criteria may include the following:

- Enhanced city-to-city mobility, considering activity centers and ridership
- Improved and enhanced overall transportation capacity, regional connectivity
- Reduced travel times and improved reliability
- Leveraging existing and future transportation infrastructure
- Providing convenient, reliable, and cost-effective transit service that can increase transit’s role in the future and is competitive with the automobile
- Encourage Transit Oriented Development
- Manage, capture, and serve expected long-term growth in a balanced and sustainable manner
- Support local planning efforts to reinvent the corridor as a backbone for sustainable growth with transit and active transportation
- Encourage economic development
- Potential for Transit Oriented Communities (TOC) including first/last mile access
- Support the needs of the transit-dependent and low income populations
- Connection to Equity Communities
- Provide transit access to key activity centers within the study area
- Improve connectivity from the study area to urban hubs outside the study area
- Supply convenient, reliable, and cost-effective transit service within the study area
- Increase the share of future trips that are made using transit by providing the optimal mix of light rail, commuter rail and other transit services
- Promote job generation by enhancing transit service in the study area and encouraging transit connections
- Minimize environmental impacts
- Demonstration of community and stakeholder support

DELIVERABLES:
- Draft and Final Screening Methodology and Criteria
TASK 4: DEVELOP CONCEPTS AND ALTERNATIVES
For the purpose of clarity, this study distinguishes concepts from alternatives in the following way:

- Concepts are the initial solutions to the Mobility Problem and the study’s goals and objectives. These could be a large selection of potential solution options and will be developed at a planning level.
- Alternatives will be developed from the concepts after the initial screening analysis is conducted. These will have detailed information on various quantitative metrics including location of stations, ridership etc.

Task 4.1 Develop Initial Concepts
Based on Mobility Problem Definition (Task 2) as a guide and building on previous plans and studies, the Consultant will develop a set of up to fifteen (15) transit service concepts to respond to the mobility problem definition. These concepts may include enhancements to existing transit services, modification of planned transit service improvements, or wholly new transit services. Each alternative will be reviewed by SGVCOC for appropriateness and conformity with local/state/federal guidance.

The initial set of alternatives may include:

- Dedicated Shuttle Bus/Modified Existing Bus Service – Transportation System Management (TSM) option to maximize use of existing and planned services
- Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) – Improvements such as dedicated busway, dedicated right of way designed to provide premium express bus services and increase capacities and efficiencies over regular bus services using freeway general purpose lane or local arterial streets
- Monorail/Aerial Transit (MRT) – or other alternative transit solution – as a standalone project or complementing the existing Metro LRT network.

The definition of initial concepts will include a description of vehicle technology, preliminary route and stations, runtimes based on mph assumptions, typical configurations, and support facilities.

The consultant will prepare a technical memorandum presenting the concepts and a high level description of each concept identifying qualitative features relevant for performing a high level fatal flaw analysis.

DELIVERABLES:
- Draft and Final technical memorandum presenting range of concepts, including a high level description of each concept identifying qualitative features relevant for determining merit for performing a high level fatal flaw analysis.
Task 4.2 Screening of Concepts

In this task, the Consultant will evaluate each concept at a level of detail suitable for initial screening. Each routing and modal option will be evaluated to identify the initial benefits and constraints of each concept and a comparative ranking of each concept relative to each other will be developed. The evaluation will consist of a high level fatal flaw analysis and not include detailed metrics and technical analysis. The goal of this task will be to scale down the concepts into a smaller set of short-term alternatives (three (3)) for detailed analysis.

DELIVERABLES:
- Draft and Final Initial Concepts Screening technical memorandum

Task 4.3 Review and Refine Alternatives for Feasibility Study

The Consultant will review the features of each alternative and identify refinements to be considered in conducting the feasibility analysis (Task 7). Refinements may include modifications to the alignment and/or stations, route detail, frequency of service, and connectivity to major attractors, existing/planned area transit, etc. The Consultant will develop an overview and detailed description of the final alternatives (up to three) with details regarding the alignment configuration, technology, operational needs, and support facilities.

The refined alternatives will be vetted and approved by agency staff, prior to proceeding to Task 7.

DELIVERABLES:
- Draft and Final technical memorandum describing refined alternatives

TASK 5: RIDERSHIP FORECASTS

Task 5.1 Travel Demand Forecast Methodology

The Consultant team will develop a memorandum documenting scenario coding assumptions, including re-configuration of existing routes, new station locations, route headways, route modes, and route travel times. The memorandum will also document any additional network modification required to conduct the ridership analysis in Task 5.2.

This memorandum will include a brief discussion of potential uncertainty associated with the ridership forecasts. However, this scope of work does not include conducting an uncertainty analysis as recommended in the FTA Capital Investment Grant (CIG) process.

DELIVERABLES:
• Draft and Final Travel Demand Forecast Methodology Memorandum

Task 5.2 Prepare Model Documentation Reports

The Consultant team will use the latest version of the Los Angeles Metropolitan Transportation Authority’s (Metro) transit model (e.g., CBM18) to develop ridership forecasts for three build alternatives. Each alternative will be evaluated in the horizon year of Metro’s model. For CBM18, the horizon year is 2042.

All ridership forecasting will be conducted with the Metro transit model, as-is. No additional localized calibration, mode choice calibration, or zone splitting will be conducted under this scope of work. This work is intended as a preliminary screening analysis of potential transit investment scenarios. Additional model calibration and reporting would need to be conducted in order to meet the submittal requirements of the FTA CIG application process.

The Consultant team will code networks for up to three different build scenarios within the study area. The Consultant team will also re-run the future year business-as-usual or Long-Range Transportation Plan scenario for comparison purposes. Transit networks outside the study area or external service markets (e.g., Metrolink) will not be altered in these scenarios.

The analysis of Task 5 will include:

• Ridership by route (approximate boardings)
• Systemwide and operator ridership
• Systemwide linked trips
• Summary of transit markets including growth or decline in markets resulting from scenarios

DELIVERABLES:
• Draft and Final Travel Demand Forecasting Memorandum
• Travel Demand Model Ridership Files delivered electronically (DVD/FTP, etc.)

TASK 6: COST ESTIMATES

Based on the definition and operating characteristics of the alternatives as defined above, the Consultant will prepare capital and operating and maintenance (O&M) cost estimates for each alternative.

Task 6.1 Cost Methodology Report

The Consultant will prepare a concise Draft and Final cost methodology technical memorandum that will document the assumptions used to develop both capital and O&M costs for the alternatives. The cost methodology will be reviewed and approved by
SGVCOG prior to developing cost estimates.

- **Capital Cost Methodology** – The capital cost methodology and estimates will utilize cost-per-mile unit costs, drawn from the Consultant team’s cost data resources for similar projects, and any available information from SGVCOG, Metro, and/or Metrolink. The Consultant will document the timeframe of the cost data sources and adjust to a common timeframe. In addition, the estimating methodologies and assumptions will include a contingency methodology based on the level of design and risk. The capital cost methodology will be for the current year and will include soft costs for estimated professional services.

- **O&M Cost Methodology** – The O&M cost estimates will rely on existing Metro O&M cost models as applicable. For non-Metro operators, such as Metrolink and Foothill Transit, a cost per service hour will be used.

**DELIVERABLES:**
- Draft and Final Cost Methodology technical memorandum

**Task 6.2 ROM Cost Estimates (Capital and O&M)**

The Consultant will develop Rough Order of Magnitude (ROM) planning-level capital and O&M costs for each alternative (upto three (3)). Costs will be presented in current year dollars. The estimates will utilize the FTA Standard Cost Category (SCC) format to facilitate cost comparison to other projects.

The Consultant will develop Rough Order of Magnitude (ROM) quantities from aerial photography. The capital improvement quantities for each alternative will be prepared in appropriate detail to inform the preparation of capital costs.

The Consultant will develop planning level service and operating plans corresponding to each alternative identified in Task 6. The operating plan at a minimum will address key operating parameters including head-ways (peak and off-peak), stop locations, time points, run times (peak and off-peak), vehicle/station interface, operating hours, route miles of service and the number of vehicles needed. The operating plan for each alternative will be prepared in sufficient detail to inform the preparation of O&M costs and ridership forecasting.

**DELIVERABLES:**
- Draft and Final ROM Cost Estimates

**TASK 7: FEASIBILITY ANALYSIS OF UP TO THREE (3) ALTERNATIVES**

The purpose of the feasibility analysis is to select one or more alternatives for advancement into a subsequent formal Alternatives Analysis of selected projects, environmental analysis, or further study. The most promising alternatives will be selected
based upon the evaluation criteria developed in Task 3. The evaluation should include sufficient level of detail to compare each alternative’s performance and fulfilment of the Study’s goals and objectives, relative to each other. The evaluation will include an evaluation matrix with quantitative and qualitative criteria for comparative evaluation of alternatives used to prepare conclusions for the Feasibility Report. The evaluation of the alternatives will be a combination of quantitative and qualitative analysis, to a level that is adequate to inform the decision on selecting alternatives. The evaluation of alternatives will be vetted through the TAC and other key stakeholders.

Because of the large geographic extent of the San Gabriel Valley and considering the typical timeframes for delivery of major capital improvements, it is anticipated that more than one alternative will be recommended for further project development. The most promising alternatives will be included in a long-range “Vision Plan” for the Valley which will include a menu of project types suitable for both near- as well as long-term implementation.

DELIVERABLES:
- Draft and Final Feasibility Analysis technical memorandum
- Draft and Final Executive Summary
- Technical Appendix if required to support the Feasibility Analysis

TASK 11: STAKEHOLDER COORDINATION AND OUTREACH

The Consultant will provide technical support to SGVCOG’s Outreach Consultant for one community meeting which will be conducted at up to two (2) venues (e.g., western location and eastern location.) This support will consist of the preparation of presentation materials and attending the public meetings to assist in answering questions. Coordination and set-up of the meetings as well as the distribution of study materials will be the responsibility of the SGVCOG outreach team. The Consultant will coordinate with SGVCOG’s Project Manager, the SGVCOG Governmental Affairs Manager, and the SGVCOG’s Outreach Consultant to meet the SGVCOG standards in developing and printing materials consistent with design guidelines (such as the report templates, PowerPoint presentation, exhibits and boards), as provided by SGVCOG.

Translation for Outreach Collateral will be performed by others. Development and maintenance of study website will be performed by others.

DELIVERABLES:
- Fact Sheet – Draft and Final
- Summary of Findings – Draft and Final
- Display Panels – Draft and Final
- PowerPoint Presentation – Draft and Final
- Participation in Community Meeting(s) by Project Manager and one (1) member of Consultant team
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID</th>
<th>Task Name</th>
<th>Duration</th>
<th>Start</th>
<th>Finish</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>San Gabriel Valley Transit Study</td>
<td>250 days</td>
<td>May 1/21</td>
<td>Jun 5/22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Administrative and Project Management</td>
<td>115 days</td>
<td>Jun 6/21</td>
<td>Jul 11/2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Notice to Proceed</td>
<td>5 days</td>
<td>Jun 6/1</td>
<td>Jun 6/6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>General Project Management</td>
<td>240 days</td>
<td>Jun 6/1</td>
<td>Jul 6/2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Kick-off Meeting</td>
<td>3 days</td>
<td>Jun 6/15</td>
<td>Jun 6/17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Project Implementation Plan Draft</td>
<td>15 days</td>
<td>Jun 6/6</td>
<td>Jul 6/21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>SGVCOG Review and Comment</td>
<td>10 days</td>
<td>Jun 6/29</td>
<td>Jul 6/29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Project Implementation Plan Final</td>
<td>5 days</td>
<td>Jun 7/13</td>
<td>Jul 7/18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>CPM Project Schedule Draft</td>
<td>15 days</td>
<td>Jun 6/31</td>
<td>Jul 7/21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>SGVCOG Review and Comment</td>
<td>10 days</td>
<td>Jun 7/22</td>
<td>Jul 7/22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>CPM Project Schedule Final</td>
<td>5 days</td>
<td>Jul 7/6</td>
<td>Jul 7/11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Monthly Progress Reports and Invoices</td>
<td>240 days</td>
<td>Jun 6/1</td>
<td>Jul 6/22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Study Area Definition</td>
<td>5 days</td>
<td>Jun 15/22</td>
<td>Jun 15/22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Study Area Definition Draft</td>
<td>25 days</td>
<td>Jun 20/21</td>
<td>Jul 6/21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>SGVCOG Review and Comment</td>
<td>30 days</td>
<td>Jun 23/21</td>
<td>Jul 6/21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Study Area Definition Final</td>
<td>30 days</td>
<td>Jun 28/21</td>
<td>Jul 6/21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Mobility Problem Definition Draft</td>
<td>25 days</td>
<td>Jun 28/21</td>
<td>Jul 6/21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>SGVCOG Review and Comment</td>
<td>30 days</td>
<td>Jun 3/1</td>
<td>Jul 6/1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Mobility Problem Definition Final</td>
<td>30 days</td>
<td>Jun 8/17</td>
<td>Jul 8/20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Initial Screening and Evaluation Criteria</td>
<td>10 days</td>
<td>Jun 10/21</td>
<td>Jun 10/22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Screening Methodology and Criteria Draft</td>
<td>30 days</td>
<td>Jun 12/20</td>
<td>Jun 12/22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Develop Concepts and Alternatives</td>
<td>115 days</td>
<td>Jun 29/21</td>
<td>Jul 2/2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Develop Initial Concepts Draft</td>
<td>35 days</td>
<td>Jun 28/21</td>
<td>Jul 1/15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>SGVCOG Review and Comment</td>
<td>10 days</td>
<td>Jun 11/16</td>
<td>Jul 11/20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Develop Initial Concepts Final</td>
<td>10 days</td>
<td>Jun 28/21</td>
<td>Jul 11/16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Screening of Concepts Draft</td>
<td>20 days</td>
<td>Jun 30/21</td>
<td>Jul 12/27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>SGVCOG Review and Comment</td>
<td>10 days</td>
<td>Jun 28/21</td>
<td>Jul 1/10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Screening of Concepts Final</td>
<td>30 days</td>
<td>Jun 21/22</td>
<td>Jul 12/22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Review and Refine Alternatives for Feasibility Study Draft</td>
<td>30 days</td>
<td>Jun 11/22</td>
<td>Jul 12/22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>SGVCOG Review and Comment</td>
<td>10 days</td>
<td>Jun 28/21</td>
<td>Jul 2/22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Review and Refine Alternatives for Feasibility Study Final</td>
<td>10 days</td>
<td>Jun 22/22</td>
<td>Jul 3/2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Ridership Forecasts</td>
<td>10 days</td>
<td>Jun 20/21</td>
<td>Jul 3/2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Travel Demand Forecast Methodology Draft</td>
<td>25 days</td>
<td>Jun 10/23</td>
<td>Jul 11/29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>SGVCOG Review and Comment</td>
<td>10 days</td>
<td>Jun 11/20</td>
<td>Jul 12/15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>Travel Demand Forecast Methodology Final</td>
<td>30 days</td>
<td>Jun 12/14</td>
<td>Jul 12/27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>Prepare Model Documentation Reports Draft</td>
<td>40 days</td>
<td>Jun 14/21</td>
<td>Jul 12/27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>SGVCOG Review and Comment</td>
<td>10 days</td>
<td>Jun 29/21</td>
<td>Jul 3/22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>Prepare Model Documentation Reports Final</td>
<td>10 days</td>
<td>Jun 22/22</td>
<td>Jul 3/22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>Cost Estimates</td>
<td>10 days</td>
<td>Jun 30/21</td>
<td>Jul 3/21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>Cost Methodology Report Draft</td>
<td>25 days</td>
<td>Jun 10/21</td>
<td>Jul 1/21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>SGVCOG Review and Comment</td>
<td>10 days</td>
<td>Jun 30/21</td>
<td>Jul 12/13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>Cost Methodology Report Final</td>
<td>30 days</td>
<td>Jun 13/21</td>
<td>Jul 12/27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>ROM Cost Estimates (Capital and O&amp;M) Draft</td>
<td>30 days</td>
<td>Jun 12/21</td>
<td>Jul 1/22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>SGVCOG Review and Comment</td>
<td>10 days</td>
<td>Jun 12/25</td>
<td>Jul 2/22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>ROM Cost Estimates (Capital and O&amp;M) Final</td>
<td>10 days</td>
<td>Jun 28/22</td>
<td>Jul 3/22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>Stakeholder Coordination and Outreach</td>
<td>25 days</td>
<td>Jun 27/21</td>
<td>Jul 4/18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>Technical Advisory Committee Workshop #1</td>
<td>2 days</td>
<td>Nov 27/21</td>
<td>Dec 27/21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>Technical Advisory Committee Workshop #2</td>
<td>2 days</td>
<td>Nov 27/21</td>
<td>Dec 27/21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>Technical Advisory Committee Workshop #3</td>
<td>2 days</td>
<td>Nov 27/21</td>
<td>Dec 27/21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>Technical Advisory Committee Workshop #4</td>
<td>2 days</td>
<td>Nov 27/21</td>
<td>Dec 27/21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
$243,033 Scenario -- 12 Month Program

- 1,737 working hours in 12 mos. contract period (1,737 per year)
- 52 weeks in scope period
Hill International, Inc.  
San Gabriel Valley Council of Governments  
**San Gabriel Valley Transit Study Public Outreach Support Services**  
**TASK 1 – TEAM PROGRESS / OUTREACH COORDINATION MEETINGS**

**HILL STAFF HOURS**

- Total Hours – 143:
  - Claudia – 111  
  - Mary – 6  
  - Andrea – 18  
  - Ben – 8  

- Deliverables:
  - Preparation, attendance and follow up on one kick-off meeting
    - Assume eight (5) hours total
    - 3 hours for Claudia; 2 hours for Mary
      - **5 hours**
  - Preparation, attendance and follow up on 12 progress meetings
    - Assume minimum 3 hours per meeting, all in
    - 12 meetings total
    - 36 hours for Claudia; 4 hours for Mary
      - **40 hours**
  - Preparation and attendance and follow up for regular consultant team meetings convened by Hill
    - Assume calls every other week @ 2 hours each, all in
    - 24 meetings total = 48 hours total
    - 48 hours for Claudia; 18 hours for Andrea; 8 hours for Ben
      - **74 hours**
  - Submission of monthly progress reports for 12 months
    - Assume calls every other week @ 2 hours each, all in
    - 24 hours for Claudia
      - **24 hours**

**CONSENSUS STAFF HOURS**

- Total Hours – 99:
  - Nazan – 35  
  - Josh – 4  
  - Amy – 60  

- Deliverables:
  - Preparation, attendance and follow up on one kick-off meeting
    - Assume eight (6) hours total
    - 3 hours for Nazan; 3 hours for Josh
      - **6 hours**
  - Preparation, attendance and follow up on 12 progress meetings
      - **0 hours**
  - Preparation and attendance and follow up for regular consultant team meetings convened by Hill
    - 32 hours for Nazan
    - 1 hour for Josh
    - 60 hours for Amy
      - **93 hours**
Hill International, Inc.
San Gabriel Valley Council of Governments
San Gabriel Valley Transit Study Public Outreach Support Services

TASK 2 – COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT PROGRAM DEVELOPMENT

HILL STAFF HOURS

- Total Hours – 68:
  - Claudia – 12
  - Mary – 4
  - Andrea – 24
  - Vrej – 20
  - Ben – 8

- Projected Collateral Materials:
  - Between 3-6 PPT files
  - Between 2-5 Factsheets
  - Between 3-6 Web-based content

- Deliverables:
  - Preparation of/assist with public participation plan
    - 8 hours for Claudia
    - 4 hours for Ben
    - 12 hours
  - Assist with development of public participation schedule; coordinate with Hill and Technical Contractor
    - 4 hours for Mary
  - Preparation of Project collateral materials (Power Point, Factsheets, web-based content for community meetings)
    - 4 hours for Claudia
    - 24 hours for Andrea
    - 20 hours for Vrej
    - 4 hours for Ben
    - 52 hours

CONSSENSUS STAFF HOURS

- Total Hours – 65:
  - Nazan – 45
  - Josh – 20

- Deliverables:
  - Preparation of/assist with public participation plan
    - 15 hours for Nazan
    - 10 hours for Josh
    - 25 hours
  - Assist with development of public participation schedule; coordinate with Hill and Technical Contractor
    - 5 hours for Nazan
    - 5 hours
  - Preparation of Project collateral materials (Power Point, web-based content for community meetings)
    - 25 hours for Nazan
    - 10 hours for Josh
    - 35 hours
Hill International, Inc.
San Gabriel Valley Council of Governments
San Gabriel Valley Transit Study Public Outreach Support Services

**TASK 3 – KEY STAKEHOLDER OUTREACH AND TECHNICAL ADVISORY DEVELOPMENT**

**HILL STAFF HOURS**

- **Total Hours – 381:**
  - Claudia – 184
  - Mary – 20
  - Andrea – 112
  - Vrej – 16
  - Ben – 49

- **Projected Collateral Materials:**
  - Between 6-12 Agendas
  - Between 2-4 Factsheets
  - Between 6-12 PPT files
  - Between 6-12 Website Content

- **Deliverables:**
  - 20 Public Agencies/Elected Official Briefings
    - Assume 2.5 hours per meeting; half of the meetings for Ben (25 hours)
    - **25 hours**
  - 4 TAC meetings
    - 5 hours for Mary (3.5 hours/meeting) **20**
    - 5 hours for Claudia (3.5 hours/meeting **20**
    - **40 hours**
  - 6 Key Stakeholder Briefings
    - Assume 4 hours per meeting for Claudia; 2 hours for Andrea
    - 24 hours for Claudia; **12** hours for Andrea
    - **36 hours**
  - 1 Community Open House Meetings
    - Assume 20 hours/per meeting for Claudia
    - Assume 4 hours per meeting for Ben
    - **24 hours**
  - Preparation of *Meeting* Materials (agendas, fact sheets, presentations, website content)
    - Claudia – 120 hours
    - Andrea – 100 hours
    - Vrej – 16 hours
    - Ben – 20 hours
    - **256 hours**
Hill International, Inc.
San Gabriel Valley Council of Governments
San Gabriel Valley Transit Study Public Outreach Support Services

**CONSENSUS STAFF HOURS**

- Total Hours – 140:
  - Nazan – 40
  - Josh – 40
  - Amy – 60

- Deliverables:
  - 20 Public Agencies/Elected Official Briefings
    - Assume 2 hours per meeting; all of the meetings for Josh (40 hours)
    - 40 hours
  - 1 Community Open House Meetings
    - Assume 30 hours per meeting for Nazan
    - Assume 45 hours per meeting for Amy
    - 75 hours
  - Preparation of Meeting Materials (agendas, fact sheets, presentations, website content)
    - Nazan – 10 hours
    - Amy – 15 hours
    - 25 hours

**IMPRENTA STAFF HOURS**

- Total Hours – 10:
  - Ron – 4
  - Mandy – 3
  - Wilson – 3

- Deliverables:
  - 1 Community Open House Meetings
    - 2 hours for Ron
      - 2 hours
  - Preparation of Meeting Materials (agendas, fact sheets, presentations, website content, presentation boards, staff guides, etc.)
    - 2 hours for Ron
    - 3 hours for Mandy
    - 3 hours for Wilson
    - 8 hours
Hill International, Inc.
San Gabriel Valley Council of Governments
San Gabriel Valley Transit Study Public Outreach Support Services

**TASK 4 – COMMUNITY OUTREACH ACTIVITIES**

### HILL STAFF HOURS

- **Total Hours – 293:**
  - Claudia – 71
  - Andrea – 222

- **Deliverables:**
  - Pop-Up Events (up to 4)
    - Assume each event (research, coordinate, permitting, set up, staffing, breakdown) is 15 hours
    - Assume minimum of two staff to attend each event
    - Assume Andrea attends all 4 events (60 hours)
    - 60 hours for Andrea
  - Community Presentations (up to 6)
    - Assume five hours for each meeting (coordination, preparation, attendance, follow up)
    - Assume Andrea attends 6 meetings (30 hours)
    - 30 hours
  - Social Media Content and Monitoring
    - Assume Andrea spends three hours a week for 44 weeks **132 hours**
    - Assume Claudia spends 1 hour a week for 44 weeks **44 hours**
  - Claudia – 27 hours for additional support
    - 27 hours

### CONSENSUS STAFF HOURS

- **Total Hours – 207:**
  - Nazan – 75
  - Amy – 132

- **Deliverables:**
  - Message Development /Refinement
    - Assume total of 20 hours for Nazan (20 hours)
    - 20 hours
  - Pop-Up Events (up to 4)
    - Assume each event (research, coordinate, permitting, set up, staffing, breakdown) is 15 hours
    - Assume minimum of two staff to attend each event
    - Assume Amy attends all 4 events (60 hours)
    - 60 hours for Amy
  - Community Presentations (up to 12)
    - Assume six hours for each meeting (coordination, preparation, attendance, follow up)
    - Assume Amy attends 12 meetings (60 hours)
    - 72 hours
  - Project Management – Nazan 55 hours
    - 55 hours
Hill International, Inc.
San Gabriel Valley Council of Governments
San Gabriel Valley Transit Study Public Outreach Support Services

**IMPRENTA STAFF HOURS**

- Total Hours – 48:
  - Mandy – 24
  - Wilson – 24

- Deliverables:
  - Message Development /Refinement
  - Pop-Up Events
  - Project Management

**PREMIS COMMUNICATION STAFF HOURS**

- Total Hours – 283:

- Deliverables (for 12 months):
  - Community presentations
  - Pop-up events
  - Database updating
  - Social media support
DATE: June 10, 2021

TO: Transportation Committee

FROM: Marisa Creter, Executive Director

RE: GLENDORA FIRST/LAST MILE DEMONSTRATIONS

RECOMMENDED ACTION

For information only.

BACKGROUND

In December 2019, the Glendora City Council adopted a resolution to further refine first/last mile project concepts for Ada Avenue, Foothill Boulevard, Glendora Avenue, and Vermont Avenue. As a result, Glendora city staff engaged in public outreach activities and applied for funding to implement demonstration projects. In September 2020, the SGVCOCG awarded the City of Glendora over $30,000 for a demonstration project using repurposed Metro Open Streets grant funds.

By November 2020, a temporary first/last mile demonstration project was installed on Glendora Avenue from Foothill Boulevard to Ada Avenue. This demonstration project ran through March 2021 with the goals of supporting active transportation and public health during the COVID-19 Pandemic, evaluating potential safer street designs, and collecting detailed public feedback. The demonstration provided an excellent opportunity for the City to test improvements and observe operational benefits and drawbacks.

Through implementing the demonstration, the City observed the following:

- Angled parking is valuable to merchants and businesses along Glendora Avenue;
- Turn radii would require additional evaluation to ensure vehicles can make turns without sacrificing safety;
- Left turn pocket for the Post Office was well received; and,
- Aesthetics and materials are important to the community.

Additionally, the City learned the following project approach lessons:

- Engage in more robust outreach process before implementing the project to educate the residents and stakeholders on the background and usage of the demonstration;
- Having dedicated materials and maintenance staff on-hand for repairs and changes can be vital given that demonstration projects are generally more labor-intensive to maintain;
- Reflective tape utilized for crosswalks should only be used for demonstration during dry months; and
• The Yellow and White Pavement Lane Marking Tape largely worked well throughout the demonstration.

Glendora Transportation Manager, Steven Mateer, will provide a presentation on this item.

Prepared by: Alexander P. Fung
Management Analyst

Approved by: Marisa Creter
Executive Director
DATE:       June 10, 2021

TO:         Transportation Committee

FROM:       Marisa Creter, Executive Director

RE:         METRO HOMELESSNESS PROGRAMS

RECOMMENDED ACTION

For information only.

BACKGROUND

During the COVID-19 Pandemic, the Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority (Metro) has experienced an increase in the number of persons experiencing homelessness seeking shelter on the rail system, and riding trains throughout the day without a formal destination. As a result, Metro developed a program, known as “Operation Shelter the Unsheltered,” to assist these persons in seeking housing and support services.

Currently, riders are required to exit trains at all terminus stations, such as Union Station. This provides an opportunity for Metro staff to effectively clean and disinfect trains, in an effort to protect riders from COVID-19.

Metro used this opportunity to partner with law enforcement and several homeless outreach providers to engage with persons experiencing homelessness, as they exit trains, and offer them interim housing, mental health services, and substance abuse treatment. By tracking bed availability, Metro can subsequently provide these persons transportation to area shelters.

“Operation Shelter the Unsheltered” began last year. Since then, over 700 persons experiencing homelessness have accepted shelter through this Metro partnership. Metro System Security and Law Enforcement Chief, Judy Gerhardt, will provide a presentation on this item.
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